

REMARKS

Applicant would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided. Upon entry of the present paper, the specification and claim 8 will have been amended, and claim 17 will have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, with claims 7-9, 11, 13, 15 and 20 remaining pending before the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate. Applicant further gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of claims 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 20.

The Examiner has objected to claim 8, requiring the definition of $e^{-j\omega t}$.¹ Specifically, the Examiner has requested a definition of $e^{j\omega t}$. Without agreeing to the propriety of the Examiner's objection and solely to expedite the patent examination process, Applicant has cosmetically amended claims 8 to change "w" to ω and to define $\omega = 2\pi f$ (f is a frequency), as was recited in originally-presented claim 2 (which has since been canceled), and hereby respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure, requiring that either the description should be amended to reflect the current pending claims, or the claim numbers should be removed from the specification. By the present amendment, Applicant has removed the claim numbering from the specification, and hereby respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as not being enabling. Applicant notes that solely in order to advance the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has canceled this claim, which should not be taken as an acquiescence by Applicant as to

¹ Applicant notes that $e^{-j\omega t}$ is not present in this claim, but rather $e^{j\omega t}$ is present in this claim. In other words, there is a negative sign before superscript J and not an underscore. It is assumed that $e^{j\omega t}$ is what the Examiner requests the definition of.

the propriety of the rejection. Further, Applicant expressly reserves the right to submit a claim of a related scope in another application. Thus, the cancellation of the claim in the present application is without prejudice.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present application meets all the requirements for patentability, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the allowance of each and every pending claim in the present application.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE INDICATION OF ALLOWABLE
SUBJECT MATTER

In response to the Statement of Reasons for the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter, mailed by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on August 7, 2007, along with the above-noted Official Action, Applicant wishes to clarify the record with respect to the basis for patentability of the allowed claims in the present application. In this regard, while Applicant does not disagree with the Examiner's indications that certain identified features are not disclosed by the prior art references, as noted by the Examiner, Applicant further wishes to clarify that each of the independent claims in the present application recites a particular combination of features, and the basis for patentability of each of these claims is further based on the particular totality of the features recited therein. The dependent claims set forth additional basis for their patentability in accordance with their recited limitations as well as in accordance with the particular limitations of the respective base claims.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of record, whether considered alone, or in any proper combination thereof, discloses or suggests the present invention, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Applicant notes that the amendments to the claims are to be considered merely clarifying amendments that are cosmetic in nature, and are not intended to narrow the scope of the claims. Accordingly, this Amendment should not be considered a decision by Applicant to narrow the claims in any way.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Masahiko MUTOH



William Boshnick
Reg. No. 44,550

November 7, 2007
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191
{P31982 00183275.DOC}